

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/698,658	10/31/2003	Paul Curtis Hynek	Hynek	3772	
7590 02/15/2005		EXAMIN		NER .	
Paul Hynek 3420 Sepvlveda Blvd., #515			CARTER, MONICA SMITH		
Los Angeles, C.		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
,			3722		
			3722	3722	

DATE MAILED: 02/15/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Annlie	ation No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary							
		10/69	8,658 	HYNEK, PAUL CURTIS			
		Exami	ner	Art Unit			
			a S. Carter	3722			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply							
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).							
Status							
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed	on <u>29 Septemb</u>	er 2004.				
2a) <u></u>	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.						
3)	, -						
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposit	ion of Claims						
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) is/are object to restriction and/or election requirement.						
Applicat	ion Papers						
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) ☑ The drawing(s) filed on 29 September 2004 is/are: a) ☑ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.							
Priority (under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 							
2) Notice 3) Inform	et(s) See of References Cited (PTO-892) See of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO Smation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PT Ser No(s)/Mail Date		4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:				

Application/Control Number: 10/698,658 Page 2

Art Unit: 3722

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings were received on September 29, 2004. These drawings are approved.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 1-4, 6-8, 10, 11 and 16-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beylerian ('729) in view of Derraugh et al. ('331) and further in view of McDonald (GB 2,218,379).

Beylerian discloses a book for storing and presenting printed material comprising a single sheet of flexible, tear-resistant, accordion-folded material (25) (see col. 3, lines 37-39 and 46-49 – "folio sheets made of any of a variety of conventional sheet materials, such as paper of sheet plastic" and "the sheet material may be formed by a laminate of plastic or paper sheeting surrounding a central foil of ferromagnetic materials, such as sheet steel or the like."), the sheet having a plurality of folds dividing the sheet into portions (as seen in figure 1), including two outermost portions (15, 16), and means for stiffening the outermost portions (wherein the means is considered to be the magnetizable sheet material), at least one of the stiffening means exerting a

Art Unit: 3722

magnetic attraction (see col. 2, lines 42-46), whereby the book can be conveniently and compactly stored (as seen in figure 2).

Beylerian discloses the claimed invention except for single sheet of flexible, tearresistant, accordion-folded material being waterproof.

Derraugh et al. disclose a foam book that is waterproof and easily cleanable. The binding means (102) of the book is "water-resistant or water-proof foldable material such as cloth, nylon, plastic, foam or nylon" (see col. 3, lines 55-59). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Beylerian's invention to provide a waterproof, single sheet of flexible, tear-resistant, accordion-folded material, as taught by Derraugh et al., so a child can read and play with the book while in the bath or by the poolside and so that the book can be easily cleaned (see col. 1, lines 26-43).

Beylerian, as modified by Derraugh et al. disclose the claimed invention except for explicitly disclosing the book being tear-resistant.

McDonald discloses a foldable booklet having a single sheet (10) of flexible, tear-resistant, accordion-folded material having a plurality of folds dividing the sheet into portions, including two outermost portions (16, 18) (as seen in figure 2 and page 3, lines 15-20 —"the material of the sheet apart from the stiff portion 16, can be made of known paper-like plastics material that is tear-resistant"). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the book of Beylerian to include tear-resistant material, as taught by McDonald, to prevent inadvertent tearing of the sheet and to maintain the quality of the sheet material.

Art Unit: 3722

Regarding claims 2 and 3, Beylerian, as modified by Derraugh et al. and McDonald, discloses the sheet of the book being made of any of a variety of conventional sheet materials (see col. 3, lines 37-39 of Beylerian). This would, therefore, include multi-layered polypropylene synthetic material.

Regarding claim 4, Beylerian, as modified by Derraugh et al. and McDonald, discloses the means for stiffening comprising sheets of material that are more rigid than the single sheet and hingedly attached to the sheets (see col. 3, lines 39-43 of Beylerian). Regarding the attachment being via adhesive, it is well-known in the art of binding to bind sheets to covers by way of an adhesive composition and, therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to adhesively bind the sheets to the outermost rigid sheets.

Regarding claim 6, Beylerian, as modified by Derraugh et al. and McDonald, discloses means for stiffening the outermost portions (wherein the means is considered to be the magnetizable sheet material), at least one of the stiffening means exerting a magnetic attraction (see col. 2, lines 42-46 of Beylerian).

Regarding claims 7 and 8, Beylerian, as modified by Derraugh et al. and McDonald, discloses that the waterproof book of foam pages (as seen in Derraugh et al.) would render the book buoyant in water.

Regarding claim 10, Beylerian, as modified by Derraugh et al. and McDonald, inherently discloses that some part of the sheet is blank (i.e., marginal areas).

Regarding claim 11, Beylerian, as modified by Derraugh et al. and McDonald, disclose the sheet members forming either a memo book or diary (see col. 1, lines 5-8

Art Unit: 3722

of Beylerian) and would, therefore, accept pencil marks, which notoriously can be erased, and ink.

Regarding claim 16, see the above rejections to claim 1.

Regarding claims 17 and 18, see the above rejections to claims 2 and 3.

Regarding claim 19, see the above rejections to claims 7 and 8.

4. Claims 5 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beylerian in view of Derraugh et al. and McDonald and further in view of Moore (1,885,280).

Beylerian, as modified by Derraugh et al. and McDonald, discloses the claimed invention except for the adhesive being substantially waterproof.

Moore discloses that it is well known to use waterproof adhesive to bind waterproof paper sheets together (as seen on page 2, column 1, lines 22-48). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Beylerian's invention to include waterproof adhesive, as taught by Moore, to provide a binding means capable of withstanding the effects of being used in water applications.

5. Claims 12-15 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beylerian in view of Derraugh et al. and McDonald and further in view of Hirasawa (699).

Beylerian, as modified by Derraugh et al. and McDonald, discloses the claimed invention except for an additional flexible, waterproof, tear-resistant material extending from the rest of the sheet by perforations, so that it can be readily removed.

Hirasawa discloses a promotional article comprising an accordion-folded sheet of material (48) having an additional sheet (46) that may be separated from the remainder of the sheet by perforations (see figure 4 and col. 5, lines 3-7). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Beylerian's invention to include an additional sheet separated from the remainder of the sheet by perforations, as taught by Hirasawa, to provide removable coupons or other promotional items from the sheet to be redeemed by the user.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed September 29, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that neither Beylerian or Derraugh disclose the use of tearresistant sheeting. Applicant further argues that Beylerian teaches away from tearresistance, since Beylerian teaches using paper which tears easily.

The examiner asserts that as noted in the previous Office action, Beylerian discloses using "any of a variety of conventional sheet materials, such as paper or sheet **plastic**." (column 3, lines 37-39). Beylerian has not restricted the material for the sheet to be fabricated of paper. Beylerian discloses that paper or plastic may be used for the sheet. McDonald discloses that it is known to provide an accordion-folded booklet

fabricated of paper-like plastics material that is tear resistant. Therefore, the plastic sheet of Beylerian is capable of being tear-resistant as evidenced by McDonald. The examiner, therefore, maintains that Beylerian discloses a single sheet of flexible, tear-resistant, accordion-folded material 25.

It is noted that Derraugh is solely used for disclosing a book having waterproof sheet material and has not been relied upon for disclosing any of the other claimed limitations.

Applicant argues that Legrand fails to disclose the use of waterproof adhesive as a bookbinding agent in the manner of the current invention. This argument is most since this reference has been withdrawn from the rejections.

Applicant has failed to provide any arguments regarding the Hirasawa reference. However, it is noted that Hirasawa is solely used for disclosing a sheet having an additional flexible, material extending from the rest of the sheet by perforations and has not been relied upon for disclosing any of the other claimed limitations.

For the reasons as set forth above, the rejections are maintained.

Conclusion

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Monica S. Carter whose telephone number is (571) 272-4475. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday (6:00 AM - 3:30 PM).

Application/Control Number: 10/698,658 Page 8

Art Unit: 3722

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Derris Banks can be reached on (571) 272-4419. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

February 14, 2005

MONICAS. CARTER PRIMARY EXAMINER